

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 07/03/08, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-8 and 10-21 are pending.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections and the Examiner's reasoning thereof, especially in light of the amendment to the pending claims. In the Office Action mailed 07/03/08, the Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, citing terms "high" and "very high" as not defined by the claim. Applicant has amended claims 7, 14 and 15 to remove those terms. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 10, 11, 14-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruo et al. (U.S. Patent 7,146,007; "Maruo") and Easley et al. (U.S. Patent 6,259,482; "Easley"); claims 2, 4, 6-8, 12, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley and Maruo, in view of Hanna (U.S. Patent 5,796,842); claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley and Maruo, in view of Peiffer et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0131350; "Peiffer") or Frederiksen (U.S. Patent 4,922,537); claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley and Maruo, in view of Jaffe (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0197810); claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley and Maruo, in view of Bestler et al. (U.S. Patent 5,638,112; "Bestler"); and claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley, Maruo and Hanna, in view of Bestler.

In reply, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 11 and 19 to claim that the encoding and the modulating (mixing in claim 19) are performed by components resident on the same complementary metal oxide semiconductor (CMOS) integrated circuit chip. None of the cited references disclose this claimed aspect of the embodiments of the invention. Maruo and Easley, being cited in every one of the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) fail to disclose this feature as well. Easley teaches a digital BTSC compander system, but fails to disclose the combination of a BTSC encoder

and a RF modulator integrated on the same CMOS integrated circuit chip. Maruo likewise fails to disclose the integration of the BTSC encoder and RF modulation on the same integrated circuit chip as well.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims distinguish over Easley and Maruo, or Easley and Maruo in combination with the other cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and Applicant solicits the Examiner for the allowance of pending claims 1-8 and 10-21, as amended.

Furthermore, in this response, Applicant is submitting amendments to the specification and the abstract, since errors or omissions were noted. Applicant requests the Examiner to enter the noted amendments to the specification and the abstract.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 09/30/2008

By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com